

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

April 8, 2002

LB 277, 1085

SENATOR SCHIMEK: It's not necessary, Senator Landis. You are the last light. We are on the Redfield amendment. Senator Redfield, you are recognized to close.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Senator Schimek. I would ask that the house be called, please.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: There's been a request to call the house. All in favor say...or vote aye; all opposed vote nay. The house is under call, will...would you record first, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: 30 ayes, 0 nays to place the house under call, Madam President.

SENATOR SCHIMEK: The house is under call. Will all those who are absent from the Chamber please return and record your presence. The house is under call. Senator Redfield, did you wish to continue with your closing? Your time is running.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Senator Schimek. For those of my colleagues who were off the floor, this is LB 277, which eliminated the marriage penalty. I recognize that it has a cost and the reason it has a cost is because, in fact, two-wage-earner married couples have been paying \$39 million a year more than they would if they had remained single. Now if you are comfortable with increasing the income tax burden in LB 1085 on couples who are already paying \$39 million more than they would if they were single then you will vote against this amendment. But if that gives you some discomfort you may think that it is worth the cost of \$7 million a year. The first year that you see in the fiscal note is because it is more than a 12-month year. It's about 18 months so, in fact, there is a larger note. And I recognize that that exists and it's costly. But I feel very strongly that if you're going to build on your base, that your base must be consistent and it must be fair, and I don't believe that we've been fair. My colleagues agreed in two rounds of debate last year and I think if we're going to talk about revenue we need to talk about it as a package, not as a separate bill later on Final Reading, because we would need to take it into consideration in our appropriations approach on all